

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7-10, 12-19, 21, 23-30, 32-34, 37-41, 43-45, 48-52, and 54-57 are now pending in the application, of which claims 1, 24, 37, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 55 are independent. Applicants respectfully urge that all of the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action claims 1-3, 32-34, 37-45 and 48-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,868,526 to Singh (hereafter “Singh”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0206654 by Teng (hereafter “Teng”).

Although the Examiner does not indicate that claims 7-10, 12-19, 21 and 23-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Singh in view of Teng on page 2 of the Office Action, it appears that these claims were rejected as well.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections.

42 and 53 had been previously canceled. Therefore, the above § 103 rejection of these claims is moot.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method comprising:
 - receiving an input for selecting a first graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system, the first graphical object having one or more properties;
 - displaying a list of one or more transformation operations performable on the first graphical object for transforming the first graphical object into a second graphical object for the executable block diagram;
 - receiving an input for selecting one of the one or more transformation operations;
 - applying the selected one of the one or more transformation operations on the first graphical object for creating the second graphical object, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object; and
 - incorporating the first graphical object and the second graphical object into the executable block diagram.**

The Applicants respectfully submit that Singh and Teng taken either, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the following feature of claim 1:

incorporating the first graphical object and the second graphical object into the executable block diagram.

Singh generally discusses selecting a subsystem block from a graphical elements library. The user drags and drops the selected subsystem block in the model window. See Col. 5, line 63 - Col. 6, line 4. The user may modify one or more parameters of the subsystem block copied from the library. See Col. 6, lines 39-43. The system then displays the modified subsystem block to the user. See Col. 7, lines 30-36. In Singh, only the modified block is incorporated in a block diagram. Singh does not disclose or suggest ***incorporating the first graphical object and the second graphical object into the executable block diagram***, as provided in Applicants' claim 1.

Teng does not cure the shortcomings of Singh with respect to disclosing or suggesting incorporating both graphical objects into an executable block diagram. Teng discusses replacing an object in a dynamic image. The dynamic image is a dynamic file or a real time dynamic image. See [0002]. The dynamic image discussed in Teng is digital information recorded using a digital video camera, i.e. a digital video. See [0005]. Specifically, Teng discusses replacing the face of the person on a dynamic image with a selected pattern. The first dynamic image is transformed to a second dynamic image having the replaced pattern. The second dynamic image is saved and displayed to the user. See Claim 12. As such, in Teng, only the second dynamic image is saved and displayed to the user. Teng and Singh, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination, do not teach or suggest ***incorporating the first graphical object and the second graphical object into the executable block diagram***, as provided in Applicants' claim 1.

Furthermore, the Examiner alleges that Teng is an analogous art of morphing and performing object modifications. See Office Action, page 4, lines 1-2. Applicants respectfully disagree. The present application involves executable graphical block diagram models that represent dynamic systems. Teng's dynamic images are not executable graphical block diagram models. Moreover, neither Teng nor Singh provide any disclosure of how to adapt Teng's technique of replacing an object in a dynamic image for use with graphical block diagram models.

Applicants respectfully urge that it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art to combine the teachings of Teng with those of Singh. The teaching of Teng and Singh cannot be combined without further changing their respective functions. Specifically, Singh indicates that the term “graphical block diagram” refers to a set of graphical blocks or nodes and a set of lines (or signals) that carry data between the graphical blocks. Each graphical block typically performs a function and that functions (or equation) is a sub-component of an overall set of equations describing a dynamic system. See Col. 3, lines 54-59. Singh further indicates that using the equations defined by the blocks, the graphical block diagrams can be executed in an interpreted environment to produce simulation results as defined by the graphical blocks and signals in a model. See Col. 4, lines 1-4. On the other hand, Teng indicates that a dynamic image is a shooting of a scene or location saved using a digital video camera. See [0005]. Teng further indicates that dynamic images comprise people tableaux. See [0024]. It is not clear how one of skill in the art can apply the teachings of Teng about modifying a dynamic image to an executable, i.e. simulatable, graphical block diagram of Singh. Therefore, combining the teachings of Singh and Teng would not yield predictable results as it will be uncertain how the teachings of these references will operate once their respective functions are modified.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully urge that Singh and Teng, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest Applicants’ claimed *incorporating the first graphical object and the second graphical object into the executable block diagram*, which is present in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above §103 rejection of claim 1.

B. Claims 2, 3, 7-10, 12-19, 21, 23 and 56-57

Claims 2, 3, 7-10, 12-19, 21, 23, and 56-57 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every feature of claim 1. Applicants respectfully urge that claims 2, 3, 7-10, 12-19, 21, 23, and 56-57 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above §103 rejection of claims 2, 3, 7-10, 12-19, 21, 23, and 56-57.

C. Claims 24-30, 32-34, 37-41, 43-45, 48-52, 54 and 55

Independent claims 24, 37, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 55 recite features similar to the features set forth in claim 1. Claims 24, 37, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 55 include ***incorporating the first graphical object and the second graphical object into the executable block diagram***, which, as noted above, Singh and Teng, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination, fail to disclose or suggest.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Singh and Teng, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 24, 37, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54, and 55.

Dependent claims 25-30, 32-34, 38-41, 43-45, and 49 incorporate each and every feature of the independent claims upon which they depend. Thus, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 25-30, 32-34, 38-41, 43-45, and 49 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 24, 37, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 55.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above § 103 rejection of claims 24-30, 32-34, 37-41, 43-45, 48-52, 54, and 55.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-089RCE. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: April 1, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:/Kevin J. Canning/
Kevin J. Canning
Registration No.: 35,470
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant